

REMARKS

1. This paper is responsive to the Office Action mailed February 27, 2003.

Reconsideration and further examination is respectfully requested.

5

2. In brief, the present invention is a method of selecting data from a computer graphics frame buffer in an efficient manner for display.

3. Claims 1-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over
10 Lawless et al. (US Pat. # 5,371,514) in view of Kim et al (US Pat # 5,355,443).

4. Regarding claim 1, the Examiner claimed that, "Lawless teaches the claimed
'display system' comprising: 'a memory' (Lawless, column 4, lines 22-53); and
--- 'an attribute system' (Lawless, column 8, lines 35-68)." However, while Lawless' _____
15 "display system," includes a frame buffer memory as described in column 4, lines
22-52, applicant is unable to find any mention or description of "an attribute
system" in column 8, lines 35-68, equivalent to that described in applicant's patent
application. The Examiner admits that, "Lawless does not explicitly teach the
'framed [sic] buffer attribute data' as claimed. However Lawless' selection of
20 different portions of frame buffer suggests the arrangement of storage capacity in
the buffer (see also Kim, column 18, lines 24-46)." It appears that in column 8,
lines 35-68, Lawless is describing a method of updating frame buffer memory to
include data for the top-most primitive that was picked, but was hidden from view
by earlier-drawn primitives. (See Lawless, column 8, lines 28-35). However,
25 nowhere does Lawless describe an "attribute system." Applicant is unable to find

anywhere in this portion of the patent that Lawless claims, teaches, or suggests the use of attribute data to allow the frame buffer controller to select between a plurality of logical regions of frame buffer memory. The Examiner also claimed that, "it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, in view of the teaching of Kim, to configure Lawless' system as claimed because the arrangement of different portions of the frame defines "frame buffer attribute" as claimed." However, applicant must respectfully traverse. Notice that in column 18, lines 44-46, Kim explicitly states that, "the operator selects which regions of which frame buffers will be displayed on the video monitor..." This directly contradicts one of the features of applicant's invention. In the present invention, attribute data referring to the logical region(s) of memory to be accessed from the display of a given tile of pixels is used to automatically select the correct region of memory from a plurality of regions of frame buffer memory. Unlike applicant's invention, Kim requires the operator to make the selection. Thus, applicant believes that the limitations of an attribute system [that] selects graphics data from fewer than all of said logical regions based on said attribute data are clearly distinguished from the Lawless and Kim patents. Thus, applicant believes that claim 1 has been adequately distinguished from the Lawless and Kim patents and is in a condition suitable for allowance.

5. Regarding claim 2, the Examiner claimed that, "Claim 2 adds into claim 1 the store of graphics data and frame attribute data in separate physical memories which Kim teaches in figure 8 and Lawless suggests in figures 3 and 8."
- However, as discussed above, neither Lawless nor Kim claim, teach, or suggest an attribute system ... [that] selects graphics data from fewer than all of said logical

regions based on said attribute data. Thus, while the frame buffer memory and the video RAM disclosed by Kim may comprise physically separate memory devices, since neither Lawless nor Kim disclose attribute data capable of distinguishing between logical regions of frame buffer memory, applicant's claims are distinguished from the inventions disclosed by Lawless and Kim. Thus, applicant also believes that claim 2 has been adequately distinguished from the Lawless and Kim patents, and is therefore in a condition suitable for allowance.

6. Claims 3-6, 7-8, and 9-10 were rejected "under a similar reason," due to their "similarity" to claims 1-2. Applicant respectfully suggests, that since claims 1 and 2 have been distinguished from the teachings, disclosures, and suggestions of Lawless and Kim, claims 3-6, 7-8, and 9-10 are similarly distinguished from the teachings, disclosures, and suggestions of Lawless and Kim, and thus are also in a condition suitable for allowance.

7. For these reasons, this application is considered to be in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

by 

Leslie P. Gehman

Reg. No. 45,624

June 26, 2003

Fort Collins, CO 80528-9599

(970) 898-3642